

Application Number: 10/821,382

Remarks

The examiner rejected claims 1-9, under 35 U.S.C. §102 and rejected claims 1-10, under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as being indefinite. The examiner suggested that the previous amendment to the claims wherein it is recited that "R₄ is lower alkylamino heterocyclyl with the proviso that lower alkylamino defined herein is not para-substituted with -CH₂NH- when Z is the phenyl ring" is not deemed to be persuasive. The examiner also suggested that the previous amendments of R₄:

"aminoheterocyclyl with the proviso that heterocyclyl defined herein is not selected from N-lower alkylpyrrolidinyl or N-lower alkylpiperidinyl,

lower alkylamino heterocyclyl with the proviso that lower alkylamino defined herein is not para-substituted with -CH₂NH- when Z is the phenyl ring" which lacks description in the specification as filed. As can be seen from present above amendments to the claims, these previous amendments of R₄ have been canceled. Therefore, these grounds for rejection have been obviated.

The examiner rejected claim 10, under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph, suggested that the specification does not reasonably provide enablement for a composition comprising a solvate or hydrate. As can be seen from the present above amendment, claim 10 has been canceled. Therefore, these grounds for rejection have been obviated.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that the application is condition for allowance, so that a prompt and favorable response is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
GUOQING PAUL CHEN
Tel: 626-482-9676
Dated: January 8, 2007

